

Spring 2012

Member and Non-Member Perceptions of the CDPAANYS Outreach and Education Grant

Kenneth B. Holmes

Binghamton University--SUNY

Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/mpa_capstone_archive



Part of the [Health and Medical Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Holmes, Kenneth B., "Member and Non-Member Perceptions of the CDPAANYS Outreach and Education Grant" (2012). *MPA Capstone Projects 2006 - 2015*. 22.

https://orb.binghamton.edu/mpa_capstone_archive/22

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations, Theses and Capstones at The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in MPA Capstone Projects 2006 - 2015 by an authorized administrator of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.

MEMBER AND NON-MEMBER PERCEPTIONS OF THE CDPAANYS OUTREACH
AND EDUCATION GRANT

BY

KENNETH B. HOLMES

BA, Binghamton University, 2007

CAPSTONE PROJECT

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters in Public Administration in the Graduate School of
Binghamton University
State University of New York
2012

Accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters in Public Administration
in the Graduate School of
Binghamton University
State University of New York
2012

Kristina Lambright
Assistant Professor
Department of Public Administration
May 3, 2012

Pamela Mischen
Associate Professor
Department of Public Administration
May 3, 2012

Bryan O'Malley
Executive Director
Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State
May 3, 2012

Executive Summary

The New York State Department of Health (DOH) recently began funding a grant to the CDPAANYS, an organization whose members focus on the delivery of self-directed home care. This grant funds outreach and education to stakeholders concerning the statewide availability of the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Program (CDPAP), a home care program for Medicaid eligible New Yorkers. CDPAANYS is an interorganizational membership organization, and its 14 members do not cover all of New York's 62 counties. However, the DOH grant required CDPAANYS to conduct statewide outreach that promotes both member organizations and non-members. This research study examined how the outreach and education grant was perceived by CDPAANYS members and non-members.

Through the use of a statewide internet survey—filled out by 11 CDPAANYS members and 11 non-members—and five telephone interviews, I was able to determine how the outreach grant was perceived and how those perceptions varied between members and non-members. I found that: (1) all of the interviewed fiscal intermediaries wanted to have information about the grant but some intermediaries had received more information than others; (2) both members and non-members viewed CDPAANYS favorably, but perceptions of the outreach grant varied; (3) the majority of survey respondents believe the grant matches CDPAANYS's mission, and the vast majority of the members who completed the survey believe that CDPAANYS has drifted closer to its mission in the last year; (4) survey respondents believed personal assistants benefitted the least and local social service districts benefitted the most from the outreach grant; and (5) there is discontent among some CDPAANYS members.

Table of Contents

Problem Definition_____	1
Research Question_____	4
Literature Review_____	4
Resource Dependence_____	5
Mission Drift_____	5
Increased Professionalism_____	6
Nonprofit Executives_____	7
Nonprofit Boards_____	7
Methodology_____	8
Data Collection_____	8
Survey_____	9
Interviews_____	10
Survey and Interview Questions_____	11
Analysis_____	11
Strengths_____	12
Limitations_____	12
Findings_____	13
Recommendations_____	21
Conclusion_____	24
References_____	25
Appendices_____	28
A – Human Subjects Research Approval_____	29
B – Survey Instrument_____	31
C – Interview Protocol_____	36
D – First E-mail to Research Participants_____	37
E – Second E-mail to Research Participants_____	38
F – Interview Request E-mail_____	39
G – Survey Response Tables and Cross Tabs _____	40
H – Interview Themes_____	45

List of Tables

Table 1: Favorable views of CDPAANY'S in the survey_____	15
Table 2: Changing favorability of the CDPAP outreach and education grant_____	17
Table 3: How the CDPAANY'S mission and outreach aligned_____	18
Table 4: Perceptions on whether CDPAANY'S moved closer to its mission_____	19
Table 5: Populations that benefit from the outreach grant_____	20
Table 6: Populations that benefits the most from the outreach grant_____	20

Problem Definition

Government grants to nonprofits come with a mandate of equity, where grantees must provide service to a whole population of constituents. Such a mandate could be seen as a benefit to grantee nonprofits, as expanding one's constituency is a smart way to weather the uncertainty of government budget cycles (Smith, 2004, p. 382). However, the academic literature on government contracting does not discuss how a broad mandate affects organizations that are primarily funded through member dues. Service to a broad population may dissuade members from paying those dues or it may instead bolster the member rolls. This project focused on the outreach grant recently distributed to the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State (CDPAANYS) and how that grant was perceived by both member and non-member organizations.

The New York State Department of Health (DOH) recently began funding a grant to the CDPAANYS, an organization whose members focus on the delivery of self-directed home care. This grant funds outreach and education to stakeholders concerning the statewide availability of the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Program (CDPAP), a home care program for Medicaid eligible New Yorkers. Individuals authorized for CDPAP ("consumers"), or their designated representative, manage their own plan of care and are responsible for recruiting, hiring, training, supervising, scheduling, and dismissing the personal assistants of their choice to provide the necessary care.

Personal assistants are the employees of the consumers, but they are paid by a fiscal intermediary, an organization under contract with a local Department of Social Services to process the payroll of that county's personal assistants. Fiscal intermediaries

receive a portion of the Medicaid funds to cover fringe benefits and administrative costs. CDPAANYS represents 14 of approximately 41 fiscal intermediaries known to have a contract with at least one of New York's 62 counties (Bogart, 2011). Local Departments of Social Services can contract with multiple fiscal intermediaries, as each organization provides different supports and restrictions on the consumer. The 14 fiscal intermediaries represented by CDPAANYS ("members") each pay dues and agree to a best practice that both empowers consumers to live independently and protects the member FI's organizational health. Several of the remaining 36 fiscal intermediaries are in direct competition with CDPAANYS members, and some operate in a manner that violates CDPAANYS's best practices.

The DOH outreach and education grant has the potential to significantly affect the organizational health of CDPAANYS, as the actions of outreach personnel can have an impact on how both member and non-member fiscal intermediaries perceive CDPAANYS and value of membership dues. The DOH grant funds outreach in every county, and the CDPAANYS staff members who are funded by the grant are expected to promote CDPAP without allegiance to any specific FI. When outreach personnel conduct outreach in the same county as a member, they are potentially bringing more consumers to that member and increasing its revenue stream. However, in counties with multiple fiscal intermediaries, outreach could affect the revenue stream of a member's competition, including other CDPAANYS members and non-members. Additionally, outreach efforts may be supporting non-member fiscal intermediaries who violate CDPAANYS best practices. While the outreach grant application was written and supported by member organizations, it has the ability to negatively affect those same

members by directly supporting their competition and by potentially encouraging the practices which they oppose.

As a membership organization, CDPAANYS has a vested interest in both the successful implementation of the DOH grant and in keeping its members satisfied. Dues are based on a member's volume of consumers. Therefore, actions that increase the number of consumers served by members directly benefits CDPAANYS's efforts. Furthermore, the visibility of CDPAANYS through outreach personnel may persuade non-members to join. Growing the membership base by one or two fiscal intermediaries would provide CDPAANYS with enough funds to bring on an additional staff member (B. R. O'Malley, personal communication, October 6, 2011). Alternatively, risking the dissatisfaction of members by providing aid to both their member and non-member competition may result in a shrinking membership base. The loss of one member, in the spring of 2011, left CDPAANYS with a \$6,000 budget shortfall (CDPAANYS, 2011). Without targeted research, CDPAANYS cannot accurately determine how the outreach grant is perceived and how to best move forward with future grants.

The academic literature on the effects of government grants is well established. Nonprofits tend to shift their focus away from advocacy and toward compliance (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004). However, little research has examined how such grants affect membership organizations, which arguably have more at stake by a shift in focus. Research into the effect of CDPAANYS's outreach grant will serve as a valuable example of how membership organizations respond to government grants with a mandate to serve a broad population.

Research Question

To help CDPAANY'S better understand the impact of their outreach grant, this project gauged the level of satisfaction and the general opinion of both member fiscal intermediaries and non-member fiscal intermediaries, by exploring the following research question.

1. How do both the members and non-members of CDPAANY'S view the DOH outreach and education grant?

Literature Review

CDPAANY'S is an interorganizational association that serves both its members and the public. The DOH outreach and education grant is a government contract that serves a statewide constituency. While associations are markedly different than traditional nonprofits, associations have been largely ignored in the non-profit literature (Balassiano, 2010; Smith 1991, 1993). Given this omission, this review focuses on the effects of government contracts on nonprofits. That literature provides insight into how the outreach grant may have changed CDPAANY'S as an organization and how its constituents may perceive that change.

The mandates and informal expectations that come with government contracts often create significant change within an organization. Nonprofit organizations are essentially providing a service for the government entity and that government will attempt to ensure compliance both officially through grant contract mandates (Rushton & Brooks, 2007; Smith & Lipsky, 1993) and unofficially through their power to renew and revoke funding (Froelich, 1999; O'Regan & Oster, 2002; Rushton & Brooks, 2007; Smith, 2004; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). As a result, governmental compliance often creates

changes within a nonprofit organization. In this literature review, I focus my discussion on five organizational changes: resource dependence, mission drift, increased professionalism, effects on the non-profit executive, and effects on the nonprofit board of directors.

Resource Dependence

One factor that can create change in an organization is resource dependence, which occurs when an organization becomes dependent on one form of revenue, such as government contacts. Although the implications of resource dependence are open to debate, organizations may alter their operations to maintain their revenue (Chaves, Stephens, & Galaskiewicz, 2004; Froelich, 1999; Jang & Feiock, 2007; Rushton & Brooks, 2007; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Once a nonprofit begins to provide a service, there is pressure to maintain that service and its funding. Further, if funding results in organizational growth, there is additional pressure to avoid staff layoffs (Smith, 2004). Given these pressures, resource dependent organizations may alter their operations to better align themselves with the funder. Resource dependency is an issue with all forms of nonprofit revenue, but governmental funds are one of the least volatile revenue streams and are thus especially susceptible to dependence (Froelich, 1999). Finally, governmental funding can discourage or “crowd out” other revenue streams (Horne, Johnson, & Van Slyke, 2005; Rushton & Brooks, 2007), furthering resource dependence.

Mission drift

A second organizational consequence of government contracting is that nonprofit organizations risk “mission drift,” a shift away from an organization’s specialized focus and mission (Froelich, 1999; Jang & Feiock, 2007; O’Regan & Oster, 2002; Smith, 2004;

Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Mission drift can be a consequence of resource dependence, but it may also occur when government contracts mandate service to a larger constituency (Graddy & Chen, 2006; Rushton & Brooks, 2007; Silverman & Patterson, 2010; Smith, 2004; Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Stone, 1996). There is controversy in the academic literature about the extent and impact of mission drift (Froelich, 1999; Smith & Lipsky, 1993), but an organization altering its mission does not have to be seen as a negative, as in the case of the YMCA and the Red Cross. Both organizations altered their mission and would not be where they are today without mission drift (Smith & Lipsky, 1993). On the other hand, altering a mission could have profoundly negative effects on an organization, as stakeholders may be vested in the original mission (Smith, 2004). Negative or positive, contracting organizations are at risk of mission drift.

Increased Professionalism

A third consequence of contracting with a government agency is increased professionalism. Government grant administrators will often expect nonprofit organizations to maintain a level of professionalism and skill consistent with governmental standards (Froelich, 1999; Rushton & Brooks, 2007; Smith, 2004; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). This expectation of professionalism reduces the nonprofit's level of autonomy, and it also can have budget implications. As organizations are expected to look "quasi-governmental" (Rushton & Brooks, 2007), they are often expected to have executives with advanced degrees (Smith & Lipsky, 1993) and knowledge of advanced management practices, such as quality management, benchmarking, and reengineering (Froelich, 1999). While professionals may bring skill and expertise to the organization,

they also demand higher salaries, which can reduce the funding for other organizational programs (Smith & Lipsky, 1993).

Nonprofit Executives

Although government contracting can lead to higher paid, skilled nonprofit executives, contracting places an array of demands and pressures on executives, as they administer the grant (Rushton & Brooks, 2007; Silverman & Patterson, 2010). For the duration of a government contract, many executives find themselves dealing with increased administrative duties, such as contract accountability measures, new hires, and contract mandates (Smith, 2004; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Additionally, many contracts require budget revisions or are underfunded, forcing the executive to take on additional duties and address shortfalls (Froelich, 1999; Smith, 2004). Furthermore, the executive may feel pressure to hire outside contractors, such as bookkeepers, to fulfill certain grant duties (Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Contract details can be overwhelming for non-profit executives.

Nonprofit Boards

In addition to pressures on the non-profit executive, governmental contracts often alter the role of a nonprofit's board of directors, from board focused issues to executive focused issues (Kreutzer, 2009; O'Regan & Oster, 2002; Smith, 2004; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). With the influx of administrative issues, the board begins implementing the agenda of the executive, instead of the executive implementing the board's agenda. Simply put, nonprofit boards that are predominately funded through government grants look and function differently than boards funded through other revenue (Hodge & Piccolo, 2005; O'Regan & Oster, 2002). Such a shift, compounded by the previously

mentioned organizational changes, can agitate a nonprofit's board. This is especially true when the board is composed of original organizational founders (Smith, 2004; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Alternatively, board relations can improve during government contracting (Smith & Lipsky, 1993). Expanded revenue brings expanded programming, reinforcing the mission and satisfying board members. However, board behavior is difficult to predict, as board members often view success through their own perspective (Miller, 2002).

The DOH outreach and education grant will change CDPAANYS as an organization, but the lasting effect has yet to be seen. While the literature suggests a host of organizational, executive, and board changes, CDPAANYS is an incredibly unique organization, with many stakeholders. For that reason, I surveyed the CDPAANYS member and non-member fiscal intermediaries, to understand their perception of the grant and how it affected the overall CDPAANYS organization.

Methodology

Determining the perceptions of both member and non-member fiscal intermediaries presented a unique challenge for this study and required the use of both surveys and interviews. In this section, I briefly describe my data collection methods, how question concerns affected those methods, my method of analysis, and finally a discussion of my research design's strengths and limitations.

Data Collection

Due to the size and diversity of my population, both an internet survey and a series of interviews were conducted. As there are approximately 41 fiscal intermediaries in New York, the number of respondents was not adequate for me to conduct an analysis

using inferential statistics. For this reason, exclusively using a survey would not have produced adequate results. In addition, the fiscal intermediaries are geographically and programmatically different. Therefore, interviews alone could not paint an adequate picture of their collective perceptions. However, the combination of both methods presented a more complete picture. The research method was approved by the Binghamton University's Human Subjects Research Review Committee on March, 16th, 2012 (Appendix A).

Survey. As fiscal intermediaries are spread around the state, an internet survey was designed and e-mailed to 39 employees at 31 fiscal intermediaries. Two e-mails advertising the survey were sent out from the CDPAANYS Executive Director's e-mail address, one initially advertising the survey (Appendix D) and a reminder e-mail (Appendix E). The survey was completed by 22 individuals, representing 19 different fiscal intermediaries. The response rates for respondents and fiscal intermediaries were 56.41% and 61.29%, respectively.

This study sought the opinions of all fiscal intermediaries around New York State, including CDPAANYS members. However, there is no statewide list of fiscal intermediaries. Each of New York's counties is able to contract with as many fiscal intermediary organizations as they choose, and those contracts change regularly. To establish a list of statewide fiscal intermediaries would require an individual conversation with 62 different counties. Such a task would take months to complete and would only be correct until one of those counties changed their contracts. For this reason, I tried to build the most comprehensive list possible, accepting that some fiscal intermediaries would not be contacted as part of this study. In doing so, I spoke to the CDPAANYS

Executive Director, who had information on all CDPAANY'S members and many non-members. I also spoke to the CDPAANY'S outreach workers for the grant. They work in all of New York's counties and must maintain a working knowledge of each county's contracts to adequately conduct their work. Through this process, I created a list of 41 fiscal intermediaries. Ten fiscal intermediaries were excluded from the survey, because I could not obtain contact information for those organizations. Only one of those organizations mentioned CDPAP on its website. The exclusion of these organizations is further discussed in the limitations section.

The survey was administered through SurveyMonkey and consisted of 14 closed ended questions. After filling out demographic information, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with statements about the outreach and education grant, which included the level of benefit to different populations, how closely the grant relates to CDPAANY'S mission, and how CDPAANY'S has changed over the previous year. In an effort to elicit candid answers, the survey was confidential and did not ask respondents to identify themselves. The survey instrument is contained in Appendix B.

Interviews. Interviews were conducted with five agencies. I selected four CDPAANY'S members and four non-members, at random and contacted them to request a 20 minute phone interview (Appendix F). If the employee at that fiscal intermediary was unfamiliar with the Outreach and Education grant or declined to be interviewed, I moved down the list until I had met my interview quota. Ultimately, I was only able to interview three members and two non-members, who each primarily served a different geographic region of the outreach grant. The interviews were semi-structured and open ended. Through these interviews, I explored both interviewee feelings about the grant

and how those feelings affected their opinion of CDPAANYS. Interview participants were asked to explain the purpose of the grant and identify its best and worst aspects. Additionally, I asked each participant to explain how the outreach grant related to the value of CDPAANYS. The interviews ranged from 18 – 30 minutes. The interviews were conducted confidentially. The CDPAANYS Executive Director was never told which organizations were interviewed. Appendix C contains the full interview protocol.

Survey and Interview Questions. Both the survey and the interview questions were designed to be quick, straight forward, and focused on conceptual concerns. Fiscal intermediaries are constantly working against each other, competing for business. Therefore, non-member fiscal intermediaries had almost no incentive to participate in the study and help CDPAANYS. Member fiscal intermediaries had more incentive to help CDPAANYS but are in regular contact with the CDPAANYS executive director anyway. Neither group stood to gain much from the research project and, for that reason, the survey and interviews were both short. In addition, questions that were confusing or controversial had the potential to turn off respondents and were purposefully omitted.

Analysis

Data from both research methods was analyzed to find common themes. Survey data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and cross tabs. The interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis which focuses on identifying common themes. Those themes were then compared between the two different membership groups and that was then compared against the survey results. The full survey results can be found in Appendix G, and the interview results can be found in Appendix H.

Strengths

The mixed method approach to this study allowed me to take a very complex issue and appropriately answer the research question. Due to the nature and diversity of fiscal intermediaries, no single method would have provided a clear picture of statewide perceptions. However the combination of surveys and interviews presented an opportunity for in-depth analysis. Furthermore, my methods allowed me to compare and contrast the opinions of CDPAANY'S members and non-members. By asking both groups the same set of questions, while still addressing the unique nature of each group, I was able to identify key similarities and differences. While this capstone addresses a complex issue, understanding the opinions of fiscal intermediaries is crucial to the financial sustainability of CDPAANY'S, and my study will hopefully improve the organization's sustainability.

Limitations

Given the strength of the mixed method approach, this study still had its limitations. The primary limitation to my study of fiscal intermediary perceptions was my inability to survey the whole population and my limited information about each organization. Each fiscal intermediary has a different organizational structure and climate. For that reason, any conclusions from this study must be viewed with a certain level of skepticism. The survey could have been sent to the wrong person within the organization, or the organization with the most valuable opinion could have been omitted entirely from the study. However, concerns about these limitations are somewhat tempered by the fact that the organizations most likely to be interested in belonging to CDPAANY'S were included in the study, as the list of fiscal intermediaries was

developed in conjunction with CDPAANYS staff. However, the development of an official statewide list of fiscal intermediaries and their primary contacts would have significantly strengthened this study.

In addition, I was only able to interview five individuals for this study, while I hoped to interview eight. In total, I contacted twelve individuals: three individuals never responded to my e-mails and phone calls; two indicated a willingness to be interviewed but stopped responding to my requests; and two set up an interview but did not answer their phones at the established time or contact me to reschedule. It is impossible to know why these seven individuals did not want to be interviewed. However, many of them did respond to the survey.

Findings

Upon analyzing the 22 survey responses through descriptive statistics and five interviews through thematic analysis, five key findings emerged from the data. Those findings are: (1) all of the interviewed fiscal intermediaries wanted to have information about the grant but some intermediaries had received more information than others; (2) both members and non-members viewed CDPAANYS favorably, but perceptions of the outreach grant varied; (3) the majority of survey respondents believe the grant matches CDPAANYS's mission, and the vast majority of the members who completed the survey believe that CDPAANYS has drifted closer to its mission in the last year; (4) survey respondents believed personal assistants benefitted the least and local social service districts benefitted the most from the outreach grant; and (5) there is discontent among some CDPAANYS members.

Finding #1: All of the interviewed fiscal intermediaries wanted to have information about the grant but some intermediaries had received more information than others.

All five interviewees openly discussed the amount of grant related information that they received and were interested in receiving more information on outreach activity. The first question of the interview asked for the interviewee's general opinion of the grant, and every interviewee responded by describing the amount of grant information that they had received.

Two interviewees—Member #1 and Non-Member #1—mentioned the strength of their relationship with local outreach workers. Member #1 mentioned that their local worker was reaching out to the populations “where we are struggling” and targeting the counties where the interviewee had the most trouble. This member went on further, saying that the outreach worker was a “huge asset” and “eager to work with” them. In addition, Non-Member #1 mentioned that their particular outreach worker was “a pleasure to deal with,” and “doing a wonderful job.”

Member #2 and Member #3 were not content with the amount of grant updates that they had received. Member #2 had not heard from their outreach worker “since July,” and that member was not even sure that outreach occurred in their counties. This interviewee “never really saw that [outreach] existed,” and they had not heard about the outreach from any of the local agencies, even though their organization was “well connected.” Furthermore, this member asked, “if [CDPAANYS members] are all on the same team, why isn’t everyone told what is going on?” Information sharing among all of CDPAANYS’s members was also mentioned by Member #3, who thought that reporting

to the CDPAANYS Board of Directors “could have been more thorough.” Although, that issue was, “addressed and resolved by [the Executive Director].”

The final interviewee, Non-Member #2, had never been contacted by an outreach worker. Everything that they knew about the outreach came from the opening address of the CDPAANYS Annual Conference. They wished that outreach workers had contacted them “even by e-mail.” That would have allowed them to “follow-up and put a local face on the program.”

Finding #2: Both members and non-members viewed CDPAANYS favorably, but perceptions of the outreach grant varied.

A majority of both member and non-member survey respondents viewed CDPAANYS in a favorable light. As seen in Table 1, 10 of the 11 members (90.9%) and 9 of the 11 non-members (81.8%) responded with “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” when asked how much they agreed with the statement, “I currently have a favorable view of CDPAANYS.” Only one respondent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Table 1: Favorable views of CDPAANYS in the survey

Q14: I currently have a favorable view of CDPAANYS.						
	Members		Non-Members		Overall	
	Responses	%	Responses	%	Responses	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	4.55%
Disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Neutral	1	9.09%	2	18.18%	3	13.64%
Agree	5	45.45%	7	63.64%	12	54.55%
Strongly Agree	5	45.45%	1	9.09%	6	27.27%
Agreement Rating:	4.36		3.64		4.00	
Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree						

Although most survey respondents had a positive view of CDPAANYS, the interviewees' opinions on the grant were mixed. The outreach grant was seen favorably by three interviewees and unfavorably by the other two.

Member #1 and Non-Member #1 each used the word "wonderful" to describe the grant. Both spoke glowingly about how the grant was "definitely needed" and "an extension of the good work that CDPAANYS was already doing." In addition, both struggled to identify a concern with the grant, finally settling on the fact that "the grant won't last long enough" to speak to every interested agency. Non-Member #2 was generally optimistic about the grant, but they mentioned that they were "guessing."

The final two interviewees expressed negative perceptions of the grant. Member #2 felt that the grant was, "not really worthwhile," and Member #3 mentioned that the grant, "didn't live up to expectations." Both did not feel that the outreach grant was of value to their organizations, but their perception of CDPAANYS had not changed for the worse, due to the grant. Member #3 said, "We continue to be supportive."

Survey respondents were not directly asked if they were in favor of the outreach grant. Instead a question was asked to determine how the reality of the grant varied from their initial perceptions. Survey respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement to the phrase, "my opinion of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant is more favorable now, than when I first heard about it." As seen in Table 2, four respondents disagreed with that statement. Seven members (63.6%) and three non-members (27.27%) responded with "agree" or "strongly agree." These responses reinforce the findings from the interviews, as there was a mix of opinions.

Table 2: Changing favorability of the CDPAP outreach and education grant

Q11: My opinion of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant is more favorable now, than when I first heard about it.						
	Members		Non-Members		Overall	
	Responses	%	Responses	%	Responses	%
Strongly Disagree	1	9.09%	1	9.09%	2	9.09%
Disagree	1	9.09%	1	9.09%	2	9.09%
Neutral	2	18.18%	6	54.55%	8	36.36%
Agree	6	54.55%	3	27.27%	9	40.91%
Strongly Agree	1	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	4.55%
Agreement Rating:	3.45		2.91		3.19	
Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree						

Finding #3: The majority of survey respondents believe the grant matches CDPAANYS’s mission, and the vast majority of the members who completed the survey believe that CDPAANYS has drifted closer to its mission in the last year.

Considering the favorable views of CDPAANYS, it should not be surprising that many members and non-members thought that CDPAANYS had drifted closer to its mission. The survey included two questions on mission drift; one asked respondents how closely the outreach grant aligned to the mission of CDPAANYS, and the other asked whether CDPAANYS had moved closer to its mission in the last year.

As seen in Table 3, 72.7% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the CDPAP outreach and education grant aligned with the mission of CDPAANYS. With 63.7% of CDPAANYS members strongly agreeing, this question received the highest agreement ratings of any question on the survey. However, the only individual to disagree on this question was a CDPAANYS member. All non-members responded with “agree” or “neutral.”

Table 3: Survey perceptions on how the CDPAANYS mission and outreach aligned

Q12: The CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant aligns with the mission of CDPAANYS.						
	Members		Non-Members		Overall	
	Responses	%	Responses	%	Responses	%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	4.55%
Neutral	1	9.09%	4	36.36%	5	22.73%
Agree	2	18.18%	7	63.64%	9	40.91%
Strongly Agree	7	63.64%	0	0.00%	7	31.82%
Agreement Rating:	4.36		3.64		4.00	
Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree						

By asking survey respondents how much they agreed with the statement that “CDPAANYS has moved closer to its mission within the last 12 months,” I was able to examine the extent that the grant may have caused “mission drift.” As seen in Table 4, 90.9% of members agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. All but two non-members were neutral or indicated that they did not know enough about CDPAANYS to judge. One non-member agreed with the statement, and another non-member strongly disagreed.

“Mission drift” was the only concept from the literature review that I asked about on the survey. On the other hand, the interview questions were open-ended, and in asking how their opinion of CDPAANYS had changed, I anticipated that interview respondents would volunteer other themes discussed in the literature review. This was not the case; none of five interview respondents discussed how CDPAANYS had changed. As previously mentioned, one member discussed a lack of information at the Board of Directors meeting, but that member did not discuss changing roles between the

board and the executive. Exploring that and some of the other literature review themes could be a good topic for future research.

Table 4: Survey perceptions on whether CDPAANYS moved closer to its mission

Q13: CDPAANYS has moved closer to its mission within the last 12 months.						
	Members		Non-Members		Overall	
	Responses	%	Responses	%	Responses	%
Do not know enough about CDPAANYS to judge	0	0.00%	4	36.36%	4	18.18%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	4.55%
Disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Neutral	1	9.09%	5	45.45%	6	27.27%
Agree	5	45.45%	1	9.09%	6	27.27%
Strongly Agree	5	45.45%	0	0.00%	5	22.73%
Agreement Rating:	4.33		2.86		3.78	
Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree						

Finding #4: Survey respondents believed personal assistants benefitted the least and local social service districts benefitted the most from the outreach grant.

The survey asked a series of questions regarding how the outreach grant benefits different populations, designed to examine differences between member and non-member perceptions. Table 5 shows the percentage of respondents that agreed or strongly agreed with whether the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant had benefitted specific populations. CDPAANYS members were more likely than non-members to agree or strongly agree that the grant had benefitted each population except in the case of the Department of Health. However, members and non-members did agree on the grant's biggest winners and losers. Among both members and non-members, survey respondents believed local social service districts benefitted the most (71.4% of total survey respondents indicated this group had benefitted from the grant) and CDPAP Personal

Finding #5: There is discontent among some CDPAANYS members.

As illustrated in previous findings and figures, some CDPAANYS members are dissatisfied. Looking at Table 6, when asked to identify which population benefits the most from the Outreach and Education Grant, one member wrote, “[I] have not seen any benefit” in the “other” column. In the second finding about perceptions of the outreach grant, Member #2 called the grant “not really worthwhile,” and Member #3 felt that the grant “didn’t live up to expectations.” Also discussed in Finding #2, Two CDPAANYS members disagreed with the statement that “my opinion of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant is more favorable now, than when I first heard about it.” Negative responses were seen in most of the survey and interview questions, which demonstrates discontent among members of CDPAANYS.

Recommendations

Based on both member and non-member perceptions of the CDPAANYS Outreach and Education Grant, I make three recommendations to CDPAANYS, moving forward. Those recommendations are as follows: (1) CDPAANYS should prioritize information sharing; (2) CDPAANYS should “stay the course” while examining the grant’s impact on specific populations; and (3) CDPAANYS should maintain a dialog with all of its members.

Recommendation #1: CDPAANYS should prioritize information sharing.

Sharing information about grant activities should be prioritized as the initial grant year comes to a close. Outreach workers should discuss their outreach with all CDPAANYS members and the non-members that are perceived by the outreach workers as friendly. As discussed in Finding #1, every interviewed fiscal intermediary

independently brought up their frequency of contact with outreach workers, and all indicated that they wanted more contact from outreach workers. This desire for information can be combined with the second finding; while perceptions of the grant were mixed, both members and non-members viewed CDPAANYS in a favorable light. Of those surveyed, CDPAANYS has few enemies. Taken together, one can reasonably assume that sharing information will be received well by fiscal intermediaries.

I recommend that outreach workers set up individual phone conversations with fiscal intermediaries in their regions, to simply list the presentations that occurred within that fiscal intermediary's counties and discuss relevant systematic problems. An example of a systematic problem would be social service offices that refused to meet with outreach workers or particularly hostile outreach targets. As one of the interviewed non-members referenced, this would allow fiscal intermediaries to "follow up and put a local face on the program." While the CDPAANYS Executive Director or Program Director could report this information, I recommend that the outreach workers relay this information instead. The outreach workers have an intricate knowledge of their own actions, and the interviewed fiscal intermediaries expressed a desire to speak with their outreach workers. In addition, I recommend that outreach workers also make informational phone calls to friendly non-members, as well. An example of such an organization is the interviewee that paid to attend the CDPAANYS annual conference, but had not been contacted. Nothing in the research indicated that such exchanges would be perceived negatively by members of CDPAANYS. To the contrary, CDPAANYS members perceived non-members as beneficiaries of the grant. In an effort to satisfy its

members and spread good will to potential members, information sharing should be a priority.

Recommendation #2: CDPAANY'S should “stay the course” while examining the grant’s impact on specific populations.

Information sharing aside, there is no reason to alter the primary grant activities; CDPAANY'S should “stay the course.” Member survey respondents thought that CDPAANY'S had moved closer to its mission in the last twelve months, and all survey respondents believed most of the populations listed on the survey had benefitted from the grant. However, CDPAANY'S should examine the grant’s impact on different populations, as that may be an area for improvement. CDPAANY'S may not want its members to continue to believe that local social service districts benefit the most and personal assistants benefit the least. However, it is unclear whether the perceived benefit to specific populations is the result of CDPAANY'S’s failure to communicate their actions or a problem with the actual grant implementation. For this reason, I recommend that CDPAANY'S continue in its grant activities, while examining the grant’s impact on specific populations.

Recommendation #3: CDPAANY'S should maintain dialog with member fiscal intermediaries.

Finally, I recommend that the CDPAANY'S Executive Director maintain a dialog with all of the CDPAANY'S members to address problems before they become organizational issues. The discontent that members discussed was in the context of the outreach grant, but appeared to be related to larger issues. I may have stumbled on a harsh reality that members of an association will not always be happy, but I may have

also stumbled on the beginnings of the themes from the literature review, such as changing roles of the board and executive. The discontent could be related to both internal and external changes to CDPAANY'S. Due to this uncertainty, I recommend periodic discussions with members.

Conclusion

Managing an interorganizational association and contracting with a governmental agency are difficult tasks on their own. Taken together, the CDPAANY'S Executive Director faced a significant challenge in implementing the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant effectively while satisfying many stakeholders. This research demonstrated that while there are a few areas for improvement, many of those stakeholders were satisfied with the end result. CDPAANY'S can serve as a valuable example to interorganizational groups applying for government contracts.

References

- Balassiano, K., & Chandler, S.M. (2010). The emerging role of nonprofit associations in advocacy and public policy: Trends, issues, and prospects. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39, 946-955. doi: 10.1177/0899764009338963
- Bogart, V. (2011). *Consumer directed personal assistance program (cdpap) agencies in NYS* [fact sheet]. Retrieved from <http://cdpaanys.org/CDPAP%20list%20by%20county.pdf>
- Chaves, M., Stephens, L., & Galaskieicz, J. (2004). Does government funding suppress nonprofits' political activity? *American Sociological Review*, 69, 292-316. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3593088>
- Consumer Directed Personal Assistant Association of NYS. (2011, August 2). *Board of directors meeting*.
- Eikenberry, A.M., & Kluver, J.D. (2004). The marketization of the non-profit section: civil society at risk? *Public Administration Review*, 62, 132-140. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00355.x
- Froelich, K.A. (1999). Diversification of revenue strategies: Evolving resource dependence in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28, 246-268. doi: 10.1177/0899764099283002
- Graddy, E.A., & Chen, B. (2006). Influences on the size and scope of networks for social service delivery. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16, 533-552. doi: 10.1093/jopart/muj005

- Hodge, M.M, & Piccolo, R.F. (2006). Funding source, board involvement techniques, and financial vulnerability in nonprofit organizations: A test of resource dependence. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 16, 171-190. doi: 10.1002/nml.99
- Horne, C.S, Johnson, J.L., Van Slyke, D.M. (2005). Do charitable donors know enough--and care enough--about government subsidies to affect private giving to nonprofit organizations? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34, 136-149. doi: 10.1177/0899764004272192
- Jang, H.E., & Feiock, R.C. (2007). Public verse private funding of nonprofit organizations: Implications for collaboration. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 31, 174-190. doi: 10.2753/pmr1530-9576310202
- Kreutzer, K. (2009). Nonprofit governance during organizational transitions in voluntary associations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 20, 117-133. doi: 10.1002/nml.244
- Miller, J.L. (2002). The board as a monitor of organizational activity: The application of agency theory to nonprofit boards. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 12, 429-450. doi: 10.1002/nml.12407
- O'Regan, K., & Oster, S. (2002). Does government funding alter nonprofit governance? Evidence from New York City nonprofit contractors. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 31, 359-379. doi: 10.1002/pam.10050
- Rushton, M., & Brooks, C. (2007). Government funding of nonprofit organizations. In Young, D.R. (Ed.), *Financing Nonprofits* (1st ed., pp. 69-91). New York: National Center on Nonprofit Enterprise.

- Silverman, R.M., & Patterson, K.L. (2010). The effects of perceived funding trends on non-profit advocacy: A national survey of non-profit advocacy organizations in the United States. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 24, 435-451. doi: 10.1108/09513551111147169
- Smith, D.R. (1991). Four sectors or five? Retaining the member-benefit sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 20, 137-150. doi: 10.1177/089976409102000203
- Smith, D.R. (1993). Public benefit and member benefit nonprofit, voluntary groups. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 22, 53-68. doi: 10.1177/089976409302200105
- Smith, S.R. (2005). Managing the challenges of government contracting. In Herman, R. & Associates (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership & management* (2nd ed., pp. 371-390). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, S.R., & Lipsky, M. (1993). *Nonprofits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Stone, M.M. (1996). Competing contexts: The evolution of a nonprofit organization's governance system in multiple environmental. *Administration and Society*, 28, 61-89. doi: 10.1177/009539979602800103

Appendices

Human Subjects Research Approval	Appendix	A
Survey Instrument	Appendix	B
Interview Protocol	Appendix	C
First E-mail to Research Participants	Appendix	D
Second E-mail to Research Participants		Appendix E
Interview Request E-mail	Appendix	F
Survey Response Tables and Cross Tabs		Appendix G
Interview Themes	Appendix	H

Appendix A

Human Subjects Research Approval

Date: March 16, 2012

To: Ken Holmes, CCPA

From: Anne M. Casella, CIP Administrator
Human Subjects Research Review Committee

Subject: Human Subjects Research Approval
Protocol Number: 1948-12
Protocol title: *Member and Non-Member Perceptions of the CDPAANYS Outreach and Education Grant*

Your project identified above was reviewed by the HSRRC and has received an Exempt approval pursuant to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations, 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) .

An exempt status signifies that you will not be required to submit a Continuing Review application as long as your project involving human subjects remains unchanged. If your project undergoes any changes these changes must be reported to our office prior to implementation, using the form listed

below:http://humansubjects.binghamton.edu/2009_Forms/012_Modification%20Form.rtf

Principal Investigators or any individual involved in the research must report any problems involving the conduct of the study or subject participation. Any problems involving recruitment and consent processes or any deviations from the approved protocol should be reported in writing within five (5) business days as outlined in Binghamton University, Human Subjects Research Review Office, Policy and Procedures IX.F.1 Unanticipated Problems/adverse events/complaints. We also require that the following form be submitted:

<http://humansubjects.binghamton.edu/Forms/Forms/Adverse%20Event%20Form.rtf>

University policy requires you to maintain as a part of your records, any documents pertaining to the use of human subjects in your research. This includes any information or materials conveyed to, and received from, the subjects, as well as any executed consent forms, data and analysis results. These records must be maintained for at least six years after project completion or termination. If this is a funded project, you should

be aware that these records are subject to inspection and review by authorized representative of the University, State and Federal governments.

Please notify this office when your project is complete by completing and forwarding to our office the following form:

<http://humansubjects.binghamton.edu/Forms/Forms/Protocol%20Closure%20Form.rtf>

Upon notification we will close the above referenced file. Any reactivation of the project will require a new application.

This documentation is being provided to you via email. A hard copy will not be mailed unless you request us to do so.

Thank you for your cooperation, I wish you success in your research, and please do not hesitate to contact our office if you have any questions or require further assistance.

cc: file

Kristina Lambright

Diane Bulizak, Secretary

Human Subjects Research Review Office

Biotechnology Building, Room 2205

85 Murray Hill Rd.

Vestal, NY 13850

dbulizak@binghamton.edu

Telephone: [\(607\) 777-3818](tel:(607)777-3818)

Fax: [\(607\) 777-5025](tel:(607)777-5025)

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

The New York State Department of Health has awarded a grant to the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State (CDPAANYS), a statewide organization whose members' focus is the delivery of self directed home care services in New York State. The objective of the grant is to increase awareness regarding a Medicaid home care program called the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Program (CDPAP). As part of the grant, CDPAANYS, is conducting outreach and education efforts to promote statewide awareness of the availability of the CDPAP.

You are invited to participate in a research study of fiscal intermediary perceptions of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant. This study is being conducted for CDPAANYS, as a graduate capstone project at Binghamton University. Through this study, we hope to learn how the outreach and education grant is viewed from perspective of all CDPAP fiscal intermediaries around the state. This study is not part of the Outreach and Education Grant and will not utilize any grant funding.

If you choose to participate, you will complete the following online survey, which will take you about 5 minutes. We will not ask for identifying information and your response will remain confidential. Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with CDPAANYS or Binghamton University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.

Please note that this survey is only for individuals that had heard of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant before being notified for the survey. If you were previously unaware of the grant and would like to be connected with an outreach worker in your region, please contact Ken at kholmes2@binghamton.edu or 607-644-6594.

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact Ken Holmes, the researcher at (607) 644-6594 or Bryan O'Malley, CDPAANYS Executive Director at (518) 813-9537. Furthermore, if at any time you have questions concerning your rights as a research subject you may call Binghamton University's Human Subject's Research Review Committee at (607) 777-3818.

*** 1. I have read the above and understand that participating in the survey implies my consent.**

☐ Yes

*** 2. I was aware of the CDPAP Outreach and Education grant before hearing about this survey.**

☐ Yes

These first three questions allow us to understand trends between regions and types of fiscal intermediaries.

If you are responding as a coordinator of a specific county within your organization, please answer for your whole organization, but feel free to skip a question if you do not know the answer.

3. Is your organization currently a member of the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State (CDPAANYS)?

- ☐ Yes, my organization is currently a member of CDPAANYS.
- ☐ No, my organization has never been a member of CDPAANYS.
- ☐ No, my organization was previously a member of CDPAANYS, but not currently.

4. How many New York State counties does your organization contract with as a fiscal intermediary for the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Program? (Please type a number)

5. Please select the regions where your organization currently contracts as a fiscal intermediary with one or more counties in that region. Select all that apply.

If you are unsure of all the regions that your organization covers, select the regions that you are certain of.

- ☐ Western Region - Allegany, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Erie, Genesee, Livingston, Monroe, Niagara, Ontario, Orleans, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Wayne, Wyoming, & Yates
- ☐ Central Region - Broome, Cayuga, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Oneida, Onondaga, Oswego, St. Lawrence, Tioga, & Tompkins
- ☐ Capital Region - Albany, Clinton, Columbia, Essex, Franklin, Fulton, Greene, Hamilton, Herkimer, Montgomery, Otsego, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schoenectady, Schoharie, Warren, & Washington
- ☐ Hudson Valley Region - Delaware, Dutchess, Orange, Putnam, Rockland, Sullivan, & Ulster
- ☐ Long Island / Westchester Region - Nassau, Suffolk, & Westchester
- ☐ New York City - Bronx, Kings (Brooklyn), New York (Manhattan), Queens, & Richmond (Staten Island)

The next three questions look at how you heard about the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant. Please answer for yourself and not for your organization.

6. Have you been contacted (visited, e-mailed, or called) by a staff member of CDPAANYS regarding the CDPAP Outreach and Education grant? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Yes, I was contacted by Bryan O'Malley, Executive Director
- ☐ Yes, I was contacted by William Lane, Ph.D., Program Director
- ☐ Yes, I was contacted by Adele Horbatiuk, Regional Outreach and Education Specialist – Long Island/Westchester Region
- ☐ Yes, I was contacted by Alicia Bonadonna, Regional Outreach and Education Specialist – Hudson Valley Region
- ☐ Yes, I was contacted by Ken Holmes, Regional Outreach and Education Specialist – Central Region
- ☐ Yes, I was contacted by Sarah Gallo, Regional Outreach and Education Specialist – Western Region
- ☐ Yes, I was contacted by Joe Lawliss, Regional Outreach and Education Specialist – New York City
- ☐ No, I was not contacted by a staff member of CDPAANYS
- ☐ I am not sure if my organization was contacted by a staff member of CDPAANYS

7. Have you attended a CDPAP Presentation given by one of the CDPAANYS Staff Members?

- ☐ Yes, I attended a presentation given by a CDPAANYS staff member.
- ☐ No, I have not attended a presentation given by a CDPAANYS staff member.
- ☐ I am not sure if I attended a presentation given by a CDPAANYS staff member.

8. Approximately when did you first hear about the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant?

- ☐ Before July 2011
- ☐ July 2011 - September 2011
- ☐ October 2011 - December 2011
- ☐ January 2012 - Present

The next set of questions look at your perceptions of the grant.

9. Please rate your level of agreement to the following statement.

The CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant is benefiting...

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
CDPAP Consumers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
CDPAP Personal Assistants.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Local Social Service Districts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NYS Department of Health.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
CDPAP Fiscal Intermediaries.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My Organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fiscal Intermediaries that are members of CDPAANYS.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fiscal Intermediaries that are NOT members of CDPAANYS.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Which population benefits the most from the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant?

- ☐ CDPAP Consumers.
- ☐ CDPAP Personal Assistants.
- ☐ Local Social Service Districts.
- ☐ NYS Department of Health.
- ☐ CDPAP Fiscal Intermediaries.
- ☐ Other (please specify)

11. Please rate your level of agreement to the following statement.

My opinion of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant is the more favorable now, than when I first heard about it.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

12. The mission of CDPAANYS is as follows. "The Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State supports consumer directed assistance providers and recipients in all counties of New York State, offering supportive services, including, but not limited to: advocacy, systems change, and the promotion of consumer control and self determination."

Please rate your level of agreement to the following statement.

The CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant aligns with the mission of CDPAANYS.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

13. Please rate your level of agreement to the following statement. (Please note that the responses have changed slightly.)

CDPAANYS has moved closer to its mission within the last 12 months.

☐ Do not know enough about CDPAANYS to judge. ☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

14. Please rate your level of agreement to the following statement.

I currently have a favorable view of CDPAANYS.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

15. Please rate your level of agreement to the following statement.

I view CDPAANYS more favorably now than I did 12 months ago.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

16. Thank you for your time. If you have any comments about this survey instrument, please leave them in the following box.

Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Hi, this is Ken Holmes. We scheduled an interview on your perceptions of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant. Do you need a second?

Before we begin, let reiterate a couple things. Your decision whether or not to participate in this research will not prejudice your future relations with the CDPAANYS or Binghamton University. Additionally, you are not obligated to answer all questions and may stop at any time.

I will ask you some questions about your feelings on the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant, and it should only take 20 minutes. Your responses will remain confidential. Additionally, I encourage you to be candid; there are no questions that deal directly with myself or any specific outreach workers.

If you have any additional questions later, myself or Bryan O'Malley will be happy to answer them. If at any time you have questions concerning your rights as a research subject you may call Binghamton University's Human Subject's Research Review Committee at (607) 777-3818.

Do you have any questions about the research project? May I proceed with the first question?

Grant Perceptions

- **What is your general opinion of the Outreach and Education Grant?**
- **How would you describe the purpose of the Outreach and Education Grant?**
- **In your opinion, what is the best aspect of the Outreach and Education Grant?**
- **What are your biggest concerns about the Outreach and Education Grant?**
- **To what extent do you think that the outreach grant is reaching the right populations?**

CDPAANYS

- **To what extent has your opinion of CDPAANYS changed from the time that you first heard about the grant until now?**
- **If at all, how does the outreach grant affect the value of CDPAANYS to your organization?**
- **Is there anything else that you'd like to mention?**

Appendix D

First E-mail to Research Participants

To: [Email]
From: "bryan@cdpaanys.org via surveymonkey.com"
Subject: CDPAP Outreach Survey
Body: Dear [FirstName],

We are trying to determine how our CDPAP Outreach and Education work is perceived by fiscal intermediaries around the state, and we hope that you'll take a moment to click through our survey at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx> .

This study is being conducted for CDPAANYS, as a graduate capstone project at Binghamton University. The outreach grant has given us a chance to promote CDPAP in every county of New York, and we're curious how that expanded presence is perceived by fiscal intermediaries, around the state.

The study is completely voluntary and consists of two parts, a 5 minute survey (<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>) for all statewide fiscal intermediaries and 20 minute phone interviews with eight randomly selected FIs. Both aspects will be conducted by Ken Holmes. I will not see your response, only general themes, so I hope that you will be candid and honest. This study is for our purposes only and will not utilize any grant funding.

The survey is available at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx> until Monday March 26th, and I hope that you will take the five minutes to quickly fill it out. If you have questions about or problems with the survey, you can contact Ken at kholmes2@binghamton.edu or 607-644-6594.

This survey is only for individuals that have heard of the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant before today. If you were previously unaware of the grant and would like to be connected with an outreach worker in your region, please contact Ken.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact myself or Ken, if you have specific question.

Sincerely,

Bryan O'Malley
Executive Director
Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State
272 Broadway
Albany, NY 12204
You can be removed from future survey notifications by clicking
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx> .

Appendix E

Second E-mail to Research Participants

To: [Email]
From: "bryan@cdpaanys.org via surveymonkey.com"
Subject: CDPAP Outreach Survey Reminder
Body: Dear [FirstName],

This is just a reminder that our survey on fiscal intermediary perceptions of our CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant will close next Monday, March 26th. If it is still on your to-do list, please take a moment to visit <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx> and share your opinion.

Again, if you have any trouble with the survey, please contact Ken Holmes at kholmes2@binghamton.edu or 607-644-6594.

Sincerely,
Bryan O'Malley
Executive Director
Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State
272 Broadway
Albany, NY 12204
(518) 813-9537
(518) 495-2181 cell
(518) 813-9539 fax

bryan@cdpaanys.org
www.cdpaanys.org

To remove yourself from further survey notices click
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx> .

Appendix F

Interview Request E-mail

From: Ken Holmes [ken@cdpaanys.org]
Sent: [Date]
To: [E-Mail]
Subject: CDPAP Outreach Grant Research - Interview Request

[FirstName],

This is Ken Holmes. I'm conducting a research project on Fiscal Intermediary Perceptions of CDPAANYS's Outreach and Education Grant, for my Master's Degree; you should have received a survey invite yesterday. Anyways, your organization was randomly chosen to participate in the interview portion of the research, and I'm hoping to schedule a 20 minute phone conversation with you.

I will ask you some questions about your feelings on the CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant, and your responses will remain confidential. These will be slightly different questions than the survey, so I hope that you'll also fill that out. Participation is completely voluntary, and you are not obligated to answer all questions and may stop at any time. I hope that you are willing to participate, however, as this will really give CDPAANYS a chance to understand how their actions are being perceived.

Is there a good time to call you between Friday March 23rd and Friday March 30th (with the exception of Wednesday March 28th)? I appreciate you taking the time to speak with me and will work around your schedule. Just let me know what is best.

As I said, you are not obligated to participate, so let me know either way. You are welcome to ask our Executive Director, Bryan O'Malley (518-813-9537) about my research, but I would appreciate if you didn't tell him that you were chosen to participate in the interviews. For confidentiality purposes, he will not know who was chosen.

Thanks in advance,

Ken Holmes
Regional Outreach and Education Specialist: Central Region
Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of NYS
ken@cdpaanys.org
(607) 644-6594

Appendix G

Survey Response Tables and Cross Tabs

Q3: Is your organization currently a member of the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Association of New York State (CDPAANY'S)?		
	22 Total Responses	
	Responses	%
Yes, my organization is currently a member of CDPAANY'S.	11	50.0%
No, my organization is NOT currently a member of CDPAANY'S.	11	50.0%
...previously a member of CDPAANY'S, but not currently.	7	31.8%
...has never been a member of CDPAANY'S.	4	18.2%

Q4: How many New York State counties does your organization contract with as a fiscal intermediary for the Consumer Directed Personal Assistance Program?				
22 Total Responses				
Mean	3.238095238	Range	12	Standard Deviation 3.03158
Median	2	Minimum	1	Kurtosis 5.563204
Mode	1	Maximum	13	Skewness 2.319534

Q5: Please select the regions where your organization currently contracts as a fiscal intermediary with one or more counties in that region. Select all that apply.		
	22 Total Responses	
	Responses	%
Western Region	7	31.8%
Central Region	9	40.9%
Capital Region	5	22.7%
Hudson Valley Region	5	22.7%
Long Island / Westchester Region	3	13.6%
New York City Region	0	0.0%

Q6: Have you been contacted (visited, e-mailed, or called) by a staff member of CDPAANY'S regarding the CDPAP Outreach and Education grant? Check all that apply.		
	22 Total Responses	
	Responses	%
Bryan O'Malley	10	45.5%
Bill Lane	2	9.1%
Adele Horbatiuk	2	9.1%
Alicia Bonadonna	4	18.2%
Ken Holmes	7	31.8%
Sarah Gallo	4	18.2%
Joe Lawliss	1	4.5%
Have not been contacted	3	13.6%
Not sure	0	0.0%

Q9: Please rate your level of agreement to the following statement. The CDPAP Outreach and Education Grant is benefiting...						
	Members		Non-Members		All Respondents	
	Responses	%	Responses	%	Responses	%
CDPAP Consumers.						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	4.55%
Disagree	1	9.09%	2	18.18%	3	13.64%
Neutral	2	18.18%	3	27.27%	5	22.73%
Agree	3	27.27%	3	27.27%	6	27.27%
Strongly Agree	5	45.45%	2	18.18%	7	31.82%
CDPAP Personal Assistants.						
Strongly Disagree	1	9.09%	1	9.09%	2	9.09%
Disagree	0	0.00%	2	18.18%	2	9.09%
Neutral	4	36.36%	4	36.36%	8	36.36%
Agree	3	27.27%	4	36.36%	7	31.82%
Strongly Agree	3	27.27%	0	0.00%	3	13.64%
Local Social Service Districts.						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	4.76%
Disagree	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%
Neutral	1	10.00%	3	27.27%	4	19.05%
Agree	6	60.00%	7	63.64%	13	61.90%
Strongly Agree	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	2	9.52%
NYS Department of Health.						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	1	5.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Neutral	5	50.00%	4	40.00%	9	45.00%
Agree	4	40.00%	5	50.00%	9	45.00%
Strongly Agree	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	1	5.00%
CDPAP Fiscal Intermediaries.						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	4.76%
Disagree	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%
Neutral	2	20.00%	3	27.27%	5	23.81%
Agree	4	40.00%	6	54.55%	10	47.62%
Strongly Agree	3	30.00%	1	9.09%	4	19.05%
My Organization.						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	4.55%
Disagree	1	9.09%	1	9.09%	2	9.09%
Neutral	3	27.27%	3	27.27%	6	27.27%
Agree	3	27.27%	6	54.55%	9	40.91%
Strongly Agree	4	36.36%	0	0.00%	4	18.18%
Fiscal Intermediaries that are members of CDPAANY'S.						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	4.76%
Disagree	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%
Neutral	2	20.00%	4	36.36%	6	28.57%
Agree	4	40.00%	5	45.45%	9	42.86%
Strongly Agree	3	30.00%	1	9.09%	4	19.05%
Fiscal Intermediaries that are NOT members of CDPAANY'S.						
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	5.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Neutral	4	44.44%	5	45.45%	9	45.00%
Agree	3	33.33%	5	45.45%	8	40.00%
Strongly Agree	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	2	10.00%

Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Key: 1 - Strong Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Appendix H

Interview Themes

Grant Perceptions					
	What is your general opinion of the Outreach and Education Grant?	How would you describe the purpose of the Outreach and Education Grant?	In your opinion, what is the best aspect of the Outreach and Education Grant?	What are your biggest concerns about the Outreach and Education Grant?	To what extent do you think that the outreach grant is reaching the right populations?
Member 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Wonderful -Reassure Counties -Statewide consistency -CDPAP Changing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Overview of CDPAP -Working alongside ROES -Address FI Troubles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Get message to more agencies -Comes from larger association 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -won't get out to all agencies -will expire soon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Heading right direction -ROES is addressing FI's targets
Member 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -no opinion -haven't seen it in their counties -not worthwhile -lack of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -educate about CDPAP -have not seen ROES, so do not know what going on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -none -did not think about grant until research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -no information sharing -have not heard of outreach from other agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -not sure who it has reached
Member 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -great idea -reservations about execution -peer counselors didn't work as wished -"Albany centric" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -spread awareness -peer counselors -address FI troubles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -more people now know -peer counselor training materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -upstate focused -grant ending at a difficult time -should outreach to m'ged care orgs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -met expectations -didn't make much difference in their area
Non-Member 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -wonderful -spreads information -good for consumers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -gets information out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -empowers through choice -spreads info 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -none -only positive -very needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -don't really know -ROES left them with confidence that things going well
Non-Member 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -very little knowledge -only heard at conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -educate about cdpap -not just helping members -raising tide helps all -cdpap changing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -spread awareness -increase utilization of CDPAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -may be more CDPAANYS focused and not CDPAP -cannot know without contact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -no idea, have not heard a thing -assume inclusive of all disabilities

CDPAANYS			
	To what extent has your opinion of CDPAANYS changed from the time that you first heard about the grant until now?	If at all, how does the outreach grant affect the value of CDPAANYS to your organization?	Is there anything else that you'd like to mention?
Member 1	-unclear in beginning -big fan now	-new referrals = potential revenue	-very pleased -should continue -beneficial for consumers and FIs
Member 2	-Neutral -Just a branch of CDPAANYS	-No effect -simply a contract with the state	-haven't heard anything since July -hope that ROES does due diligence
Member 3	-about the same -not a better opinion -will continue to be supportive	-no change -didn't think that it would affect revenue and didn't	-reporting to board could have been better -has been addressed
Non-Member 1	-good that CDPAANYS doing this -extension of CDPAANYS good work	-more info, more people sign up (revenue) -good for agency and consumers	-ROES does great job -influx of consumers since began -curious when it would end
Non-Member 2	-no change -no contact	-new referrals = more revenue	-if contacted, could help represent program -asked me questions about grant